

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 remain pending in this application. Claims 2-6, 8, 11-13, and 16 now stand allowed, whereas claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 21 and 26 stand rejected. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 15 to better point out and claim their invention. In view of the amendments to claims 1 and 15, applicants traverse the rejections of these claims and claims 7, 9, 10, 14, 21 and 26 that depend therefrom.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Rejection of Claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 21 and 26

Claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 14, 15, 21 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description argument. In particular, the examiner contends that applicants' specification does not explicitly describe taking the difference between the input image stream and a filtered input image stream.

Applicants' specification does not specifically use phrase "difference between the input stream and filtered input stream". Rather, applicants' specification, at page 6, lines 1-11 describes the operation of their film characterizer as follows:

The system 10 also includes a Film Grain Characterizer 23 that receives the input video stream 12 and the filtered video stream 24. From these video streams, the Film Grain Characterizer 23 outputs a message, hereinafter referred to as a grain message, that contains an identity of a model for simulating grain, as well at least one of a set of several parameters, including correlation parameters, intensity-independent parameters and intensity-dependent parameters used by the identified model on the physical process of exposure and development of the photographic film or upon processes added during the subsequent editing of the images.

Given that the input stream contains both the video image and film grain, and the filtered input stream has film grain removed, the logical implication regarding the operation of applicants' film grain characterizer (23) is that the characterizer takes the difference between the two streams to obtain film grain information.

To better point out and claim their invention, applicants have now amended claims 1 and 15 to recite the feature of *characterizing an input image information stream in accordance with an input image stream and a filtered input image...* The portion of applicants' specification at page 6, lines 1-11 provides ample antecedent basis for such amendments. As amended, claims 1

Serial No. 10/556,833
Art Unit 2625

PU040092
Customer No. 24498

and 15, and dependent claims 7, 9, 10, 14, 21 and 26 fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112.
Therefore, applicants request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants solicit entry of this amendment and allowance of the claims. If the Examiner cannot take such action, the Examiner should contact the applicant's attorney at (609) 734-6820 to arrange a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview.

No fees are believed due with regard to this Amendment. Please charge any fee or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. **07-0832**.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Robert B. Levy/
Robert B. Levy
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 28,234
Phone (609) 734-6820

Patent Operations
Thomson Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, New Jersey 08543-5312
February 25, 2011